

REMARKS

Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action have been responded to by making the corrections required. The listing of claims and the replacement abstract provided herewith should contain the requisite amendments.

In response to paragraph 3 of the Office Action, I am proposing to add some information to the specification. The added information can be determined from the prior art.

On page 12 of U.S. patent 4,632,399, there are two paragraphs being lines 27 through 55 (beginning "If, in the assembled form"; ending "the 129 rounds") which deal with the barriers in the projectional units. Part 129 is introduced as a barrier in the second to last paragraph on page 7.

Prior to the addition of the above-mentioned information, the currently examined specification on p.6 says "General principles concerning the operation of the puzzle are described in U.S. patent 4,632,399, with reference especially to figures 8 - 12." Also on p. 10, the specification says "The projectional units of the core, being identical with those of the prior art device ...". Moreover a barrier 211 for the second illustrative embodiment is clearly shown in fig. 8. Therefore the above-mentioned information should not count as new information but merely as clarification.

I have also canceled the claim in which the word "barrier" appears.

In response to paragraph 4 of the Office Action, I have included with this amendment document a replacement sheet for drawing sheet 4.

In response to paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Office Action, each claim which I currently seek to have granted has been clarified by avoiding the use of generic language "member" and referring instead to "first member" or "second member" as appropriate to context.

In consideration of paragraphs 7 and 8, concerning the inadequacy of my reference to of a controlled distance between the first member and the second member when trying to pin down the catch mechanism for claim 1, I am happy instead to advance the housing as the main feature of the invention. This I propose to do through new claim 20.

Claim 20 draws on claim 4 which you were prepared to allow. In joining the spirit of claim 4, I decided to cut back the non-essential language. I was however concerned that the space inside the semi-tubular limiter should not be confused with the storage space. The housing at one end of the arbor seems to do this for me. Using the verb "to join" in preference to the verb "to mount" would seem to be supported by the specification. Also the difference between the storage space and the core space is underscored in the final clause of the claim, beginning "thereby providing ...".

In promoting the word "arbor" to the main claim, I felt it would be appropriate to use the word once more in the specification on p. 6 and I include an amendment accordingly.

Thank you for considering these amendments.